



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXX.

MAY, 1904.

THE COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM.

A Review of Criticisms and Objections—Reflections Upon the Power, the Progress and the Prejudices of the Press—Why Specialized Concentration and Education at College Would Improve the Character and Work of Journalists and So Promote the Welfare of the Republic.

"The man who writes, the man who month in and month out, week in and week out, day in and day out, furnishes the material which is to shape the thoughts of our people, is essentially the man who more than any other determines the character of the people and the kind of government this people shall possess."

—PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, April 7, 1904.

BY JOSEPH PULITZER.

THE editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has asked me to reply to an article recently printed in its pages criticising the College of Journalism which it has been my pleasure to found and permanently to endow in Columbia University. In complying with his request I have enlarged the scope of the reply to include all other criticisms and misgivings, many honest, some shallow, some based on misunderstanding, but the most representing only prejudice and ignorance. If my comment upon these criticisms shall seem to be diffuse and perhaps repetitious, my apology is that—alas!—I am compelled to write by voice, not by pen, and to revise the proofs by ear, not by eye—a somewhat difficult task.

Some of my critics have called my scheme "visionary." If it

VOL. CLXXVIII.—NO. 570. 41

Copyright, 1904, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

be so I can at least plead that it is a vision I have cherished long, thought upon deeply and followed persistently. Twelve years ago I submitted the idea to President Low of Columbia, when it was declined. I have ever since continued to perfect and organize the scheme in my mind, until it is now accepted. In examining the criticisms and misgivings I have endeavored to do so without prejudice, anxious only to find the truth. I admit that the difficulties are many, but after weighing them all impartially I am more firmly convinced than ever of the ultimate success of the idea. Before the century closes schools of journalism will be generally accepted as a feature of specialized higher education, like schools of law or of medicine.

And now for our critics and objectors:

MUST A JOURNALIST BE "BORN?"

They object, the critics and cavillers, that a "newspaper man" must depend solely upon natural aptitude, or, in the common phrase, that he must be "born, not made."

Perhaps the critics can name some great editor, born full-winged like Mercury, the messenger of the gods? I know of none. The only position that occurs to me which a man in our Republic can successfully fill by the simple fact of birth is that of an idiot. Is there any other position for which a man does not demand and receive training—training at home, training in schools and colleges, training by master craftsmen, or training through bitter experience—through the burns that make the child dread the fire, through blunders costly to the aspirant?

This last is the process by which the profession of journalism at present obtains its recruits. It works by natural selection and the survival of the fittest, and its failures are strewn along the wayside.

The "born editor" who has succeeded greatly without special preparation is simply a man with unusual ability and aptitude for his chosen profession, with great power of concentration and sustained effort. He is one who loves his work and puts his whole heart and mind into it. He is in the strictest sense an educated man, but he has merely substituted *self*-education for education by others, making up for any deficiencies in his training by the unre-served sacrifice of strength, energy and pleasure. Even in his case might it not be an advantage to have a system of instruction that

would give him the same results at a saving of much time and labor?

Education begins in the cradle, at home, with a mother's teaching, and is continued by other influences through life. A college is one of those influences—useful, but with no magical power. A fool trailing an alphabet of degrees after his name is still a fool, and a genius, if necessary, will make his own college, although with a painful waste of effort which might be better reserved for productive work. I seem to remember that Lincoln, whose academy was a borrowed book read by the light of a pine-knot on the hearth, studied Euclid in Congress when nearly forty. But would it not have been better if that work had been done at fourteen?

All intelligence requires development. The highest profits by it; the lowest is helpless without it. Shakespeare's best play, "Hamlet," was not his first, but his nineteenth, written after growth and maturity—after the hard work, the experience, the exercise of faculties and the accumulation of knowledge gained by writing eighteen plays. As Shakespeare was a "born" genius why did he not write "Hamlet" first?

John Stuart Mill had natural talents, but they were strained to the last possible limit of accomplishment by a course of early training that was not only thorough but inhuman. His father was his college—a great college, better than any in England. Like Mill, Herbert Spencer, Buckle, Huxley, Tyndall, and Lewes were without college education, but their mental discipline was most severe. Cobden was undoubtedly a genius born, but if we compare his original style—turgid, clumsy—with the masterly clearness and force of his trained maturity, can we doubt that his brain was developed by the hardest work, just as Sandow's muscles were developed?

Of course in every field natural aptitude is the key to success. When the experiment was tried of turning Whistler into a disciplined soldier, even West Point had to lay down its arms. Your sawmill may have all the modern improvements, but it will not make a pine board out of a basswood log. No college can create a good lawyer without a legal mind to work on, nor make a successful doctor of a young man whom nature designed to sell tape. Talleyrand took holy orders, but they did not turn him into a holy man.

The great general, even more than the great editor, is supposed to be born, not made. The picturesque historian tells us that he "fell like a thunderbolt upon the enemy," and we imagine a miracle-working magician. But the truth is, that the brilliant general is simply a man who has learned how to apply skilfully the natural laws of force, and who has the nerve to act on his knowledge. Hannibal, the greatest of all in my opinion, is called a typical example of native military genius. But can we forget that he was the son and pupil of Hamilcar, the ablest soldier of his generation, born in the camp, never outside the military atmosphere, sworn in earliest boyhood to war and hatred of Rome, and endowed by his father with all the military knowledge that the experience of antiquity could give? He was educated. In his father he had a military college to himself. Can we think of Napoleon without remembering that he had the best military education of his time at the college of Brienne, and that he was always an eager student of the great campaigns of history? Frederick the Great lost his head in his first battle. It took him years to learn his trade and finally to surpass his instructors. There is not a cadet at any military school who is not expected as a necessary part of his professional preparation to study every important battle on record—to learn how it was fought, what mistakes were committed on each side, and how it was won.

Every issue of a newspaper represents a battle—a battle for excellence. When the editor reads it and compares it with its rivals he knows that he has scored a victory or suffered a defeat. Might not the study of the most notable of these battles of the press be as useful to the student of journalism as is the study of military battles to the student of war?

NEWS INSTINCT—NATURAL OR CULTIVATED.

They object that news instinct must be born.

Certainly. But however great a gift, if news instinct as born were turned loose in any newspaper office in New York without the control of sound judgment bred by considerable experience and training, the results would be much more pleasing to the lawyers than to the editor. One of the chief difficulties in journalism now is to keep the news instinct from running rampant over the restraints of accuracy and conscience. And if "a nose

for news" is born in the cradle, does not the instinct, like other great qualities, need development by teaching, by training, by practical object-lessons illustrating the good and the bad, the Right and the Wrong, the popular and the unpopular, the things that succeed and the things that fail, and above all the things that deserve to succeed, and the things that do not—not the things only that make circulation for to-day, but the things that make character and influence and public confidence?

CAN CONSCIENCE BE DEVELOPED?

"Of the ends to be kept in view by the legislator, all are unimportant compared to the end of 'character-making.' This alone is national education."—HERBERT SPENCER.

They object that moral character, like news instinct, cannot be made, but must be born. This is a very serious objection, for to me an editor without moral character has nothing. But is it entirely true? Have not the critics themselves reached their present moral altitude by degrees? Training cannot create temperament, I admit, nor perhaps radically change it; but is not conscience different from temperament? Is it not largely a question of education? May it not be considered more an acquired than an inherited or inherent quality? Is there not some reason to believe that conscience is largely a question of climate and geography? As Macaulay said: "Child murder in London leads to the scaffold; on the Ganges it is an honored religious sacrifice." A Hindu widow who burned herself to death on her husband's funeral pyre was performing the highest duty imposed by her moral sense. The English regarded her sacrifice as not only a crime, but the act of an incredible fool, and suppressed it in callous disregard of the protests of her shocked conscience.

Many an English or American married woman not only regards widowhood without any of those feelings of horror that led her Hindu sister to cut it short on the funeral pile—she often anticipates it by the help of the divorce courts, and enjoys the pleasing sensation of being the legal widow of more than one man at the same time. The missionary feels no profounder complacency in converting the cannibal than the cannibal feels in eating the missionary. A Kentucky mountaineer will commit murder, but he will not steal; a ward politician will often steal, but he will

not, as a rule, commit murder. In Turkey a man may with a clear conscience have several wives; in Tibet a woman may have several husbands; in America nobody may have more than one husband or wife in good legal standing at a time. If George Washington had been kidnapped in infancy and reared by thieves in a slum, with a thief for his only instructor, instead of the devout mother who trained him in morals and religion, is it likely that he would have grown up the Washington whom we love and revere as the father of his country?

CAN MORAL COURAGE BE TAUGHT?

They object that moral courage cannot be taught. Very true. I admit that it is the hardest thing in the world to teach. But may we not be encouraged by the reflection that physical courage is taught? It is not to be supposed that every young man who enters West Point or Annapolis, Brienne, St. Cyr or Sandhurst is a born hero. Yet the student at any of these schools is so drilled, hammered and braced in the direction of courage that by the time he graduates it is morally certain that when he takes his men under fire for the first time he will not flinch. Pride and the spirit of emulation can make masses of men do what even a hero would not venture to do alone. Is it likely that Napoleon himself would have charged in solitary grandeur across the bridge at Lodi if there had been no one to see him do it? Or would Pickett's brigade at Gettysburg have gone forward to destruction if every man in it had not been lifted out of himself by the feeling that he and his comrades were all doing a heroic thing together—a thing in which he simply could not do less than the rest?

If such things can be done for physical courage, why not for moral courage? If the mind can be taught to expose the body fearlessly to wounds and death, cannot the soul be taught to cling to its convictions against temptation, prejudice, obloquy and persecution? Moral courage is developed by experience and by teaching. Every successful exercise of it makes the next easier. The editor is often confronted by an apparent dilemma—either to yield to a popular passion that he feels to be wrong or to risk the consequences of unpopularity. Adherence to convictions can and should be taught by precept and example as not only high principle but sound policy. Might not a hundred concrete ex-

amples of inflexible devotion to the right serve as a moral tonic to the student?

MUST JOURNALISM BE LEARNED IN THE OFFICE?

They object that such making as a newspaper man needs after he has been successfully born can be done only in the actual practice of the office, or "shop."

What is the actual practice of the office? It is not intentional, but only incidental training—it is not apprenticeship—it is work, in which every participant is supposed to know his business. Nobody in a newspaper office has the time or the inclination to teach a raw reporter the things he ought to know before taking up even the humblest work of the journalist. That is not what editors are doing. One of the learned critics remarks that Greeley took young Raymond in hand and hammered him into a great editor. True. But was it not an expensive process, as well as an unusual one—the most distinguished newspaper-maker of his time turning himself into a College of Journalism for the benefit of a single pupil? Suppose a man of half Greeley's capacity, set free from the exhausting labors and the harassing perplexities of creating a newspaper every day—relieved from the necessity of correcting the blunders of subordinates, of watching to prevent the perpetration of more blunders and able to concentrate his whole heart and soul upon training his pupils—might he not be able to turn out, not one Raymond, but forty?

Incidentally, I venture to mention that in my own experience as a newspaper reporter and editor I never had one single lesson from anybody.

The "shop" idea is the one that used to prevail in the law and in medicine. Legal studies began by copying bills of costs for the country lawyer; medical training by sweeping out a doctor's office. Now it is recognized that better results are obtained by starting with a systematic equipment in a professional school. The lawyer learns nothing at college except the theory of the law, its principles and some precedents. When he receives his diploma he is quite unprepared to practise. Nor does the doctor learn to practise at the medical school. He learns only principles, theories, rules, the experience of others—the foundation of his profession. After leaving college he must work in the hospitals to acquire the art of practically applying his knowledge.

In journalism at present the newspaper offices are the hospitals, but the students come to them knowing nothing of principles or theories. The newspaper hospital is extremely accommodating. It furnishes the patients for its young men to practise on, puts dissecting-knives into the hands of beginners who do not know an artery from a vermiform appendix, and pays them for the blunders by which they gradually teach themselves their profession. We may sympathize with the students in their industrious efforts at self-education, but may we not also sympathize with the unfortunate editor who has to work with such incompetent instruments?

IS A NEW COLLEGE SUPERFLUOUS?

"To rear up minds with aspirations and faculties above the herd, capable of leading on their countrymen to greater achievement in virtue, intelligence and general well-being,—these are the ends for which endowed universities are desirable; they are those which all endowed universities profess to aim at, and great is their disgrace if, having undertaken this task and claiming credit for fulfilling it, they leave it unfulfilled."—JOHN STUART MILL.

They object that even if a college education be desirable, everything needed is already provided in the existing colleges and no special department is required.

This criticism appears to have some force. It is possible that it may be advanced with sincerity by intelligent newspaper men who know nothing of colleges, or by intelligent college men who know nothing of newspapers. But it is superficial. It is true that many of the subjects needed for the general education of a journalist are already covered in college. But they are too much covered. The student of journalism may find one course in a law school, another in a graduate school of political science, another, at the same hour, in an undergraduate class at college, and another in a department of literature.

A young man of very remarkable gifts—enough to enable him to educate himself without the help of a college—might be able to make from the catalogue a selection of courses which would appear on paper to be a very fair curriculum. It would perhaps be adequate if he could keep the studies from conflicting in hours, which he could not, and if at twenty years of age he already possessed that knowledge of the requirements of his chosen profession which I feel that twice twenty years' experience and hard work in my profession have not given me.

But after this wonderful young man has made out his list of studies he will be doomed to disappointment. The courses in history, in law, in political science and the rest will not be what he really needs as a specialist in journalism. They will give him only a fraction of the knowledge he requires on those subjects, and they will swamp that fraction in a flood of details of which he can make no use. To fit these courses to his purpose they must be remodelled and specialized. Modern industry looks sharply after its by-products. In silver-mining, gold is sometimes found as a by-product exceeding the value of the silver. So in general university courses we may find by-products that would meet the needs of the journalist. Why not divert, deflect, extract, concentrate, *specialize them for the journalist as a specialist?*

The spirit of specialization is everywhere. The lawyer is a real-estate lawyer, or a criminal lawyer, or a corporation lawyer, or possibly a criminal-corporation lawyer. Formerly the family physician treated every ailment; now there are specialists for the eye, the ear, the throat, the teeth; for men, for women, for children; even for imaginary diseases; for every possible variety of practice. And there is specialization in the newspaper offices themselves. The editor of a New York paper confined to the editorial page is as much surprised as the reader when in the morning he reads the news columns. The news editor does not know what editorials there will be; the musical critic could not write of sporting events; the man with the priceless sense of humor could not record and interpret the movements of the stock-market. The men in all these fields are specialists. The object of the College of Journalism will be to dig through this general scheme intended to cover every possible career or work in life, every profession, to select and concentrate only upon the things which the journalist wants, and not to waste time on things that he does not want.

CLASS DISTINCTIONS—WHY NOT?

They object that a College of Journalism would establish class distinctions in the profession—an invidious distinction of the few who had received the benefits of a collegiate training against the many who had not enjoyed this advantage. I sincerely hope it will create a class distinction between the fit and the unfit. We need a class feeling among journalists—one based not upon money, but upon morals, education and character.

There are still a few places in which money is not everything, and they are those in which men are joined by a bond of honorable association. The cadet at West Point is taught honor and pride in his profession. He knows that none of his comrades will lie or cheat or do anything unworthy of a gentleman, and the pleasure he feels in such associations fully compensates for his ridiculously small income. He sees thousands of vulgar people, much more prosperous than himself, living in much greater luxury, yet he would not change his life and his social circle for theirs. May we not hope that a similar education will in the future create a similar corps feeling among journalists—the same pride in the profession, the same determination to do nothing “unbecoming an officer and a gentleman”? Why not?

The journalist has a position that is all his own. He alone has the privilege of moulding the opinion, touching the hearts and appealing to the reason of hundreds of thousands every day. Here is the most fascinating of all professions. The soldier may wait forty years for his opportunity. Most lawyers, most physicians, most clergymen die in obscurity, but every single day opens new doors for the journalist who holds the confidence of the community and has the capacity to address it.

But as yet the journalist works alone. If he is a college graduate he goes to his college club as a graduate, not as a journalist. He never speaks of another journalist as “my colleague,” as the lawyer or the physician does of his professional brother. He hardly ever meets other journalists socially, in any numbers. But if the future editors of the city were in large proportion graduates of the same college and had a recognized professional meeting-place in which they could come together informally and discuss matters of common interest, would they not eventually develop a professional pride that would enable them to work in concert for the public good and that would put any black sheep of the profession in a very uncomfortable position? Such a spirit would be the surest guaranty against the control of the press by powerful financial interests—not an imaginary danger by any means.

If such a class spirit existed, no editor who had degraded himself by becoming the hireling of any Wall Street king or ring would dare to face his colleagues. He would be too conscious of having been false to his better nature, and equally false to the

traditions of his college and of his profession. It would be impossible then for any Huntington or Gould of the next generation to buy up newspapers—a thing easily feasible where hundreds of millions are at stake, unless there is a strong feeling of class pride and principle to prevent it. The knowledge that a reputable journalist would refuse to edit any paper that represented private interest against the public good would be enough of itself to discourage such an enterprise. Such a refusal would be as severe a blow to public confidence in the newspaper as the rejection of a brief by a high-minded lawyer is to the standing of a case in court.

No, there is nothing to fear in class distinctions founded on moral and mental superiority—on education and knowledge. We need more such classes, in the presence of the prevailing mania for mere money-making. The million of teachers form a class of this kind, with small pay, but with the consciousness of pursuing a noble profession. Such distinctions are especially necessary in a republic which has discarded everything in the way of rank and title and left personal merit the only thing that can dispute the worship of wealth.

HAS THE EXPERIMENT BEEN TRIED?

They object that schools of journalism have been tried and have failed. This is very shallow, and while technically true is practically untrue. There are persons occupying desk room in grimy offices who advertise to make journalists to order. There are more pretentious "correspondence schools" which tell, no doubt correctly, how to read proof and prepare copy for the press. And there have even been certain courses of lectures in colleges and universities of standing, in which gentlemen of more or less experience in journalism have expressed some general ideas about the requirements of the profession. This thus far has been the Lilliputian limit of effort in the direction of a university training for journalism.

So far as these could have any effect at all it would be in the direction of convincing the student that he would do better to choose some other profession. One lecturer, who is an exceedingly successful and able magazine editor, devoted his time to explaining the value of fiction and the "market" for short stories. He treated newspapers solely from the commercial point of view, and

never once referred to their ethical side. Another gentleman, whose ability I greatly admire and who ought to understand his subject, alleged that a young man could make more money in the law than in journalism, and ventured the surprising assertion that a reporter earns only \$20 a week. Thus at the very start he chilled the enthusiasm of young men of talent who would have been attracted if they had known that they could win more prompt and more substantial pay as beginners in journalism than in any other profession.

Something has been said of a so-called school of journalism in London, which is compared with the proposed institution at Columbia. I do not wish to disparage the London school, but it has about ten boys—not college students, just schoolboys—and its whole endowment is one travelling scholarship. I may mention incidentally that there will be five travelling scholarships at Columbia. To compare a boys' school or a few desultory courses of lectures with a college amply and permanently endowed and equipped in a great university is preposterous. Instruction in journalism has never yet had a fair chance to show what it can do. The new institution will be the first experiment of its kind.

HOW WILL TEACHERS BE FOUND?

They object that competent teachers, without whom the most ingenious plans of instruction must fail, are not to be found. I confess that this is the greatest, gravest, difficulty and danger. Like any college, we must have in the first place a combination of the highest character and capacity, with love of and aptitude for teaching. Even this is no small thing to ask, as the difficulty of the colleges in finding suitable professors may warn us. But we need something beyond and much rarer than this. Teachers of journalism should also be experienced editors. But how are we to lure a truly able editor from the active work of the profession in which there is such splendid scope for his powers and such eager competition for his services while he is in the prime of life?

The difficulty of drawing the right men from active service suggests the possibility that it may be necessary to fall back upon retired editors, who can no longer take part in the strenuous newspaper life. But my hope is that the whole profession will see in this situation an appeal to its honor and its pride. I hope

that the very difficulty of the problem will prove its own solution, by enlisting the sympathetic interest and aid of the men of power and of energy who would not waste their time on work that others could do. These men could not shirk the responsibilities of leadership if they would, nor do I believe they would if they could.

The greatest painters of Paris visit the art schools and criticise the work of the pupils. The masters of the New York bar give lectures in the law schools. The most famous physicians teach in the medical colleges. Why should the greatest editors not have an equally unselfish pride in and love of their own profession? Upon their generous sympathy and aid will depend the success of the experiment.

Nor need we confine our search to journalists. Historians like McMaster, Wilson and Rhodes; college presidents like Eliot, Hadley and Angell; judges like Fuller, Brewer and Gray—could help the work with lectures and suggestions. It is nothing new for a justice of the Supreme Court to lecture in college. Justice Story did it at Harvard, Justice Field did it at the University of California, Justices Harlan and Brewer do it now at the Columbian University at Washington. Even ex-Presidents have not thought such work belittling. Harrison lectured at Stanford and Cleveland at Princeton. And surely the greatest minds of the nation must realize how indissolubly a pure republic is linked with an upright press. National pride will, I fully trust, constrain them to do what they can for the elevation of an agency by which the destinies of the Union are so profoundly affected for good or for evil.

THINGS UNTEACHABLE.

"Our task is improved exactly as we improve our judgment by extending our knowledge, by a steady attention to one object, and by frequent exercise."

—BURKE on *"The Sublime and Beautiful."*

They object that there are some things that a College of Journalism cannot teach. I admit it. No college can give imagination, initiative, impulses, enthusiasm, a sense of humor or irony. These things must be inborn. But would not such inborn qualities be developed and strengthened in the atmosphere of the proposed college? Is not the development of such inborn qualities seen everywhere in intellectual life? The poet, it is true, is born, not made. That is also true of a great orator and a great painter.

But does not the great poet indicate and cultivate his inborn genius by instinctively devouring, even as a child, all the poetry he can procure? Keats wrote: "I long to feast upon old Homer as we have upon Shakespeare and as I have lately upon Milton." Did not such orators as Demosthenes, Cicero, Burke and Webster declaim the masterpieces of oratory and rhetoric? Did not Van Dyck and every other great painter benefit by the careful study of the work of their great predecessors in art? And with these facts in mind may we not hope that the student at Columbia, living in an atmosphere of journalism, with the highest examples and ideals of journalism constantly before him, will bring to the highest efficiency whatever dormant or inborn faculty he may possess? It seems to me that the more conclusively the critics prove certain things to be unteachable the more they prove the necessity of teaching everything possible that is teachable.

This is all that any education can do, and it is enough. Education is development, not creation. If its value depended upon its ability to bring mental qualities into existence from nothing, every educational institution from the kindergarten to the university would have to close its doors, and every educator would be out of employment.

In short, does not every mental worker, whether creative or imitative, try to steep himself in the atmosphere of his work? And is it not reasonable to suppose that our student would gain some advantage from living and working for some years in the atmosphere of journalistic training?

DOES IT COME FROM THE WRONG SOURCE?

Finally, as if all these criticisms were not crushing enough, they object that even if this endowment be needed I am not the right man to give it. I fully realize the force of this argument, and I am ready cheerfully to retire in favor of any critic who will relieve me. I volunteered in the first place simply because there was a need which nobody else appeared anxious to meet. No pride of priority will deter me from giving way to a more suitable candidate. They also object that I have proved a college course in journalism to be unnecessary by succeeding without one. Perhaps I may be permitted to judge of that. It is ingenious to use me as a club against my own plan. If I have had any success it has been because I never, so far as my individual work and

pleasure are concerned, regarded journalism as a business. From my first hour's work, through a period of nearly forty years, I have regarded journalism not only as a profession, but as the noblest of all professions. I have always felt that I was in touch with the public mind and ought to do some good every day. Perhaps I have failed, but it has not been for lack of effort.

WHAT SHOULD NOT BE TAUGHT.

"The journalist's opportunity is beyond estimate. To him are given the keys of every study, the entry to every family, the ear of every citizen when at ease and in his most receptive moods—powers of approach and of persuasion beyond those of the Protestant pastor or the Catholic confessor. He is by no means a prophet, but, reverently be it said, he is a voice in the wilderness preparing the way. He is by no means a priest, but his words carry wider and further than the priest's, and he preaches the gospel of humanity. He is not a king, but he nurtures and trains the king, and the land is ruled by the public opinion he evokes and shapes. If you value this good land the Lord has given us, if you would have a soul in this marvellous civilization and lifting power of humanity, look well to the nurture and training of your king."—HON. WHITE LAW REID.

Not to teach typesetting, not to explain the methods of business management, not to reproduce with trivial variations the course of a commercial college. This is not university work. It needs no endowment. It is the idea of work for the community, not commerce, not for one's self, but primarily for the public, that needs to be taught. The School of Journalism is to be, in my conception, not only not commercial, but anti-commercial. It is to exalt principle, knowledge, culture, at the expense of business if need be. It is to set up ideals, to keep the counting-room in its proper place, and to make the soul of the editor the soul of the paper. Incidentally I may say that I have never spent an hour in any publication office either of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* or the *World*, though I managed to establish both these journals and still own them.

In the proposed course of study, drawn up with admirable quickness by President Eliot and widely discussed as if it had been definitely adopted, Dr. Eliot included instruction in the business administration of a newspaper. He mentioned specifically circulation, advertising, manufacture and finance.

My own ideas upon many parts of the course of study are still uncertain, but upon this one point they are very decided. I am sure that, if my wishes are to be considered, business instruction of any sort should not, would not and must not form any part of the work of the College of Journalism.

The course of instruction will be decided by the Advisory Board, which is not yet appointed, acting in conjunction with the authorities of the university.

The course outlined was made in a private letter of President Eliot, and was stated when published to be merely tentative. In spite of this explanation many newspapers based their comment and criticism upon it as an accepted fact. I have the greatest admiration for the extraordinary genius and character of the president of Harvard, but nothing was further from my mind—nothing, in fact, is more inconsistent and incompatible with my intentions or repugnant to my feelings—than to include any of the business or commercial elements of a newspaper in what is to be taught in this department of Columbia College.

What is a College of Journalism? It is an institution to train journalists. What is a journalist? Not any business manager or publisher, or even proprietor. A journalist is the lookout on the bridge of the ship of state. He notes the passing sail, the little things of interest that dot the horizon in fine weather. He reports the drifting castaway whom the ship can save. He peers through fog and storm to give warning of dangers ahead. He is not thinking of his wages, or of the profits of his owners. He is there to watch over the safety and the welfare of the people who trust him.

Few men in the business office of a newspaper know anything about the principles of journalism. The proprietor himself is not necessarily a journalist. He may be, if he is capable of understanding public questions, of weighing public interests, of carrying out public tasks; if he is in touch with public feeling, realizes public duties, is in sympathy with the public welfare, and is capable of presenting his ideas to the people, either by his own pen or by the pens of others. But it is quite conceivable that some proprietors are deficient in these points.

My hope is that this College of Journalism will raise the standard of the editorial profession. But to do this it must mark the distinction between real journalists and men who do a kind of

newspaper work that requires neither culture nor conviction, but merely business training. I wish to begin a movement that will raise journalism to the rank of a learned profession, growing in the respect of the community as other professions far less important to the public interests have grown.

There is an obvious difference between a business and a profession. An editor, an editorial writer or a correspondent is not in business. Nor is even a capable reporter. These men are already in a profession, though they may not admit it, or even realize it, as many of them unhappily do not. Ill or well, they represent authorship, and authorship is a profession.

The man in the counting-room of a newspaper is in the newspaper business. He concentrates his brain (quite legitimately) upon the commercial aspects of things, upon the margin of profit, upon the reduction of expenses, upon buying white paper and selling it printed—and that is business. But a man who has the advantage, honor and pleasure of addressing the public every day as a writer or thinker is a professional man. So, of course, is he who directs these writers and reporters, who tells them what to say and how to say it, who shows them how to think—who inspires them, though he may never write a line himself, and decides what the principles of the paper shall be. For example, the greatest editor in the whole history of European journalism, John Delane, never wrote any articles of his own, although for thirty-six years he was the head, the heart, the brain of the *London Times*. But he directed every writer, he furnished the thought, the policy, the initiative; he bore the responsibility, and he corrected both manuscript and proofs.

In this relation perhaps it may be interesting to note that Delane studied law and was admitted to the bar before he became its editor at the age of twenty-four. But it was without any intention of practising. His father, who was a lawyer for the *Times*, destined him for its service from his boyhood, and he joined its staff as a reporter soon after passing his legal examinations. Delane, with his editorial revision, elimination and substitution, was like some of the great old painters, who seem to have much of their work, measured by mere bulk, done for them by pupils. Rubens, or Van Dyck, or Raphael furnished the idea, the design, the composition, in an original drawing; the pupils did the drudgery of execution. Then the artist added the finish-

ing touches that lifted the picture to the rank of a masterpiece. Only in that way could the enormous output ascribed to those masters have been produced. So it was with Delane, and so it is with every editor who knows how to make the most of his powers.

That a newspaper, however great as a public institution and a public teacher, must also be a business is not to be denied, but there is nothing exceptional in this. Elements of business, of economy, of income and outgo, are in the government of the city, the State, the nation, in art, in every school, in every college, in every university, indeed, in every church. But a bishop, even though he receives pay for his work, is not regarded as a business man; nor is a great artist, though he charge the highest possible price for his paintings and die as rich as Meissonier or Rubens. Many distinguished lawyers, such as Mr. Tilden—one of the greatest—were shrewd business men, able probably to outwit the majority of publishers, yet they were rightly considered members of a learned profession.

George Washington had extraordinary business capacity. By intelligent economy, method, sound judgment and the closest attention to details he accumulated the greatest American fortune of his time. Yet when he was called to serve the country in the field he did it without a salary. At Mount Vernon he was a business man; in history he is a soldier, a statesman and the father of his country.

To sum up, the banker or broker, the baker or the candlestick-maker is in business—in trade. But the artist, the statesman, the thinker, the writer—all who are in touch with the public taste and mind, whose thoughts reach beyond their own livelihood to some common interest—are in professions.

DANGERS OF PLUTOCRACY AND DEMAGOGY.

"Our improvement is in proportion to our purpose."

—MARCUS AURELIUS.

Nothing less than the highest ideals, the most scrupulous anxiety to do right, the most accurate knowledge of the problems it has to meet, and a sincere sense of its moral responsibility will save journalism from subservience to business interests, seeking selfish ends, antagonistic to the public welfare. For instance, Jay Gould once owned the principal Democratic newspaper of

America. He had obtained it from Col. "Tom" Scott in a trade for the Texas Pacific Railroad, and I was fortunate enough to be able to relieve him of his unprofitable burden. C. P. Huntington bought a New York newspaper and turned it into a Democratic organ, he himself, like Gould, being an ardent Republican. He hoped in this way to influence Mr. Cleveland's administration and the Democrats in Congress against making the Pacific railroads pay their debts of about \$120,000,000 to the Government. Incidentally he testified under oath that his journalistic experiment cost him over a million dollars, although his newspaper was so obscure that its utterances were hardly more than soliloquies. Mr. Huntington did somehow succeed in delaying for a number of years the enforcement of the Treasury's claims. More dangerous, however, than the plutocratic control of newspapers for sordid private ends is their control by demagogues for ambitious, selfish ends. The people know, with unerring instinct, when a newspaper is devoted to private rather than to public interests; and their refusal to buy it limits its capacity for harm. But when a demagogic agitator appeals to "the masses" against "the classes" and poses as the ardent friend of the people against their "oppressors," assailing law and order and property as a means of gaining followers among the discontented and unthinking, the newspaper becomes a dangerous power for evil. Especially is this true when money is freely used to mislead the people.

Commercialism has a legitimate place in a newspaper, namely, in the business office. The more successful a newspaper is commercially, the better for its moral side. The more prosperous it is, the more independent it can afford to be, the higher salaries it can pay to editors and reporters, the less subject it will be to temptation, the better it can stand losses for the sake of principle and conviction. But commercialism, which is proper and necessary in the business office, becomes a degradation and a danger when it invades the editorial rooms. Once let the public come to regard the press as exclusively a commercial business and there is an end of its moral power. Influence cannot exist without public confidence. And that confidence must have a human basis. It must rest in the end on the character of the journalist. The editor, the real "journalist" of the future, must be a man of such known integrity that he will be above the sus-

picion of writing or editing against his convictions. He must be known as one who would resign rather than sacrifice his principles to any business interest. It would be well if the editor of every newspaper were also its proprietor, but every editor can be at least the proprietor of himself. If he cannot keep the paper from degrading itself, he can refuse to be a party to the degradation.

By far the larger part of the American press is honest, although partisan. It means to do right; it would like to know how. To strengthen its resolution and give to its wisdom the indispensable basis of knowledge and independence is the object of training in journalism.

THE MARCH OF PROGRESS.

"I know but two ways by which society can be governed: the one is by Public Opinion, the other by the Sword."—MACAULAY.

In an interesting review of its seventy years of life, the *New York Sun* estimated the total circulation of the six morning papers existing in New York at its birth at 18,000 copies a day. Since then four of these six journals have died, and the *Tribune*, *Times*, *Herald* and *World* have been born.

To-day the New York morning papers alone print more than a million copies of every issue. At least 1,500,000 copies more are added every working-day by the evening papers which seventy years ago did not exist. In other words, for every New York newspaper sold in 1833, 140 are sold now to fourteen times as many people. Where there used to be nearly three families to every newspaper, there are now over three newspapers to every family.

There are men now living whose memories can bridge that gap of seventy years. In 1833 Andrew Jackson was President. The entire United States had less than the present population of the States of New York and Pennsylvania, and far less wealth than is concentrated to-day within half a mile of Trinity Church. There was not an American settlement west of the Missouri, and the few cabins were the only marks of civilization on the site of Chicago. New York City was smaller than Detroit is now. Washington was a swamp in which coaches were mired down and abandoned on Pennsylvania Avenue, and cows grazed on the site of the British Embassy. A generation had

passed since Jackson had resigned his seat in the Senate because it took him nearly six weeks to make the journey between Philadelphia, then the capital, and his home—a longer time than it has taken within the past year to girdle the globe—but there were yet Senators who found the trip to Washington not much shorter. Still there were steamboats on the navigable rivers, and stage-coaches drawn over rails by steam-engines had just begun to astonish the inhabitants of a few favored localities. The horse was still the usual motor for high-speed traffic, and the ox or the mule the customary freight-engine. “De Witt Clinton’s ditch” across the State of New York was the commercial marvel of the age. The people of Virginia were strangers to the people of Pennsylvania, and the journey from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh was longer and vastly more arduous than the journey now from Boston to the City of Mexico. The farmer reaped his grain with a scythe and cradle, and threshed it with a flail or under the feet of horses. Whale-oil lamps glimmered feebly through the darkness of the city streets. Nails were made by hand on the blacksmith’s forge. In the country a calico gown was a luxury, to be worn on state occasions. Colleges were few and puny. Harvard, the most ambitious of them all, was a high school in which a few professors taught Latin, Greek, moral philosophy and a little mathematics, leading in most cases to a course in theology. There was not a single real university in America. There were no great libraries.

In the best presses of that day, and for many years after, it was necessary to feed the paper by hand, one sheet at a time, print it on one side and then feed it again and print it on the other. All the presses then in existence would not have been able to print a single edition of a leading New York newspaper of our time, such as whirls between the cylinders of a Hoe machine from endless rolls of paper at the speed of the Niagara rapids. All the paper-mills then in the country could not have met the demands of such a journal for white paper. All the news-gathering agencies in the world would have hopelessly broken down in the attempt to provide even a fraction of its present daily supply of information. Had any one suggested then that children were already born who would be still living and reading when news would be flashed from Tokyo to New York by lightning and printed before it happened—who would see on

the same page despatches of the same date from India, from Siberia, from Australia, from Corea and from the sources of the Nile; that one of them in Boston could talk with his own voice to another in Omaha; that they would see newspapers printed on ships on the Atlantic containing news shot on invisible waves over a thousand miles of ocean, and that they could take breakfast in New York and dine in London a week later, he would have been treated as an eccentric "visionary."

So much for the seventy years upon which the old man can look back—what of the seventy years to which the boy can look forward?

The population of the Republic is still increasing at a rate that is more than equivalent to annexing a Canada every four years. New York promises to displace London in twenty or thirty years as the first city of the world. Nearly a million immigrants landed last year—the greatest human flood in all modern history. Electric trains have already been driven at a hundred and fifty miles an hour—as great an advance on the ordinary express train of 1904 as that has been on the stage-coach of 1833. Wireless telegraphy is in its feeble infancy, and radium is hinting of things unsuspected. The nations are drawing together. The International Postal Union and international conventions on copyrights, tariffs, arbitration and other matters of common concern are teaching them that it is as easy to cooperate as to quarrel. At the smallest rate of increase we have ever known in any census period the population of the United States would not be less than 290,000,000 in seventy years from now. Even allowing for any reasonable decline in the rate of growth it can hardly fall below 200,000,000.

We are embarked, whether we like it or not, upon a revolution in thought and life. Progress is sweeping forward with accelerating force, outstripping in decades the advance of former centuries and millenniums. All professions, all occupations but one, are keeping step with that majestic march. Its inspiration has fired all ranks of the marching army, or must we except the standard-bearers? The self-constituted leaders and enlighteners of the people—what are they doing? Standing still, lost in self-admiration, while the hosts march by? Are they even doing as well as that? Is it not a fact that the editors of seventy years ago were, as a rule, better informed in law, politics, government

and history than those of to-day? The statesmen and lawyers and political students who used to do editorial work for ambition or intellectual pleasure have ceased to frequent the newspaper offices. There is no trade so humble that it is not developing a standard of competence based on thorough training. For the more intellectual professions—law, medicine, art, architecture, music, engineering in all its varied branches—the years of preparation are stretching over ever-lengthening periods.

Is the most exacting profession of all—the one that requires the widest and the deepest knowledge and the firmest foundations of character—to be left entirely to the chances of self-education? Is the man who is everybody's critic and teacher the only one who does not need to be taught himself?

WHAT SHOULD BE TAUGHT—AND HOW?

"He (Gladstone) was never very ready to talk about himself, but when asked what he regarded as his master secret, he always said, concentration. Steady practice of instant, fixed, effectual, attention. . . ."—JOHN MORLEY.

Style.—Everybody says that a College of Journalism must teach good English style. But what is a good style and how shall it be taught?

The importance and the rarity of a really good English style are so great that, to my own mind, this college will be worth all its cost if it shall succeed only in teaching the future generations of journalists what a wonderful art Style is and how to perfect themselves in it.

"The style is the man," said Buffon; by which he obviously meant that the best thing in any man's writing is that which is individual—giving his own thought in his own way. But the important thing is to develop the style that is the man in a manner to make it conform to the requisites of the best newspaper writing, namely, accuracy, clearness, terseness and forcefulness.

The literary art is in general very inadequately taught and very little appreciated in this country. No artist aspires to fame without a knowledge of form and color and drawing. But one has only to read the newspapers and the books without number issued from the press to perceive that many authors

audaciously begin their careers without having learned to write.

In no profession is the art of writing more important than in journalism, which is daily turning out a literature—ephemeral, it is true, and in great part bad, but still the literature of the millions. Yet one style will not answer the manifold requirements of a newspaper. There must be a different style for each kind of work—polemical, descriptive, analytical, literary, satirical, expository, critical, narrative—and the mind of the editor, like a trained musical ear, must be able to detect every note out of place. An argumentative editorial on the tariff must not be written in the vein that would be appropriate to a pathetic description of a mother's search for a lost child, nor must a satirical dissection of a politician resemble a report of a bankruptcy case.

But, through all the varied styles fit for use in a newspaper there runs one common feature—public interest. Whether the subject he touches be profound or trivial, the journalist must not be dull nor involved, nor hard to understand. He must know exactly what he wants to say, how to say it and—when to stop. He must have a Gallic lucidity and precision.

He must have the critical faculty, for all newspaper work involves criticism and analysis. The journalist criticises everything under the sun; his eye is always at the mental microscope and his hand on the dissecting-knife.

Acute journalists gradually fashion their own styles through observation and practice. They can never be relieved of that necessity by any attempt to fit a ready-made style to them; but may they not be helped by a course of instruction systematically explaining what journalism requires, with illustrations of good and bad work?

THE LAW.

"Honest and independent journalism is the mightiest force evolved by modern civilization. With all its faults—and what human institution is faultless?—it is indispensable to the life of a free people. The frontiers of the constitutional privilege of the press are as wide as human thought, and it is one of the glories of our country that its journalism, as a whole, is incorrupt, fearless and patriotic. It is the never-sleeping enemy of bigotry, sectionalism, ignorance and crime. It deserves the freedom which our fathers gave it. It has justified itself."

—ALTON B. PARKER, Chief Judge of the New York Court of Appeals.

Everybody says that Law must be taught. Assuredly!—but how?

There are manifold branches of the law. International law, constitutional interpretation, the law of corporations, of contracts, of real estate, wills, patents, divorce, the criminal law and a score of other important subjects each command the almost undivided attention of legal experts who have practically become specialists.

To attempt the mastery of all phases of the law as taught in a law school would be impossible for a student of journalism. Nor is it necessary. Here again the fundamental idea underlying the entire scheme of this college, of *specializing the instruction*, is seen to be essential. The regular student of law must learn not merely the principles, but the practice and precedents, of his profession. But the journalist needs to know only the principles and theories of law and so much of their application as relates directly to the rights and the welfare of the public. The art of selection must be employed in separating the essential and the practical from the non-essential and the impractical.

Take the question of franchises, which has become so important to municipalities and to the country at large. Would not a series of special lectures, prepared by a competent jurist, instruct those who aim to become teachers and guardians of the people as to the nature and proper limitations of public franchises? A clear definition of the nature and responsibilities of a "common carrier" and of the reservations and conditions which it is right to impose upon corporations that seek the use of public property, like the streets of a city, for private gain, would be of great advantage to those who will be called upon to protect the public interests in the future.

There is much in the papers—and a good deal, it must be confessed, that is either ignorant or demagogic, or both—in denunciation of monopolies. How many know the fundamental fact that oppressive monopolies are abhorrent to the common law, which we inherited from England? How many know the difference between common law and statute law? President Cleveland, President Roosevelt, and even the astute Mr. Olney, thought a constitutional amendment necessary to enable Congress to forbid and punish "trusts, monopolies or other conspiracies in restraint of trade." But the Supreme Court has frequently decided, and

has just reaffirmed the truth that for twelve years I maintained in my newspaper, that under the common law all these combinations are unlawful and subject to the restraint of Congress under the Constitution.

The relations of capital and labor, which present one of the greatest problems before us as a nation and one filled with potentialities of the gravest danger, and the ownership or regulation of public utilities by municipalities or by the nation, both involve many strictly legal or constitutional points. The discussion of these questions in the press is too commonly partisan, superficial or demagogic. Would it not be of great advantage to the press and the public if journalists were instructed in the basic principles of law and equity in these matters? Is it not entirely practicable to teach them the legal meaning of such phrases as "eminent domain," "vested rights," "the public welfare" (as used in the Constitution), "corporate privileges" and the like?

The writ of injunction—or "government by injunction" as it has been mischievously called—would it not be enlightening and useful if a great jurist like Justice Brewer or James C. Carter or Joseph Choate were to give to the students in the College of Journalism a history of this writ, and a dispassionate account of its uses and necessity and possible limitations in a free government?

And so of divorce—the press teems with scandals arising from the too easy sundering of marriage ties. Clergymen deplore its evils, moralists suggest impossible remedies, legislators meddle only to muddle. Would it not conduce to the enactment of a national divorce law, uniform and stringent, if the journalists of the future were impressed with the anomaly of forty-five separate and often conflicting laws of marriage and divorce in this indissoluble Union?

The fundamental things—the settled principles of law—that touch closely the life and the welfare of the people, can surely be taught in a series of lectures by eminent lawyers, aided by the standard text-books. Nearly forty years ago, preparatory to my admission to the bar in St. Louis, I not only read but *studied* Blackstone; and I have never seen the day in my whole journalistic experience when I did not feel thankful for what I then learned of the *principles* of law.

A carefully specialized course of study, adapted to teach the student of journalism what he needs to know, and omitting the

things that are not required by one who has no intention of practising law, will, it seems to me, prove to be not only wholly practicable, but in the highest degree useful. No subject is more important, for Law is the basis of Civilization, the regulator of Liberty, the safeguard of Order, the groundwork of Government, the formal expression of a nation's ideas of Justice—and Justice is the supreme test of any and all government.

ETHICS.

Everybody says that ethics should be taught. But how?

I have expressed myself poorly indeed if I have not made it clear that here is the heart of the whole matter.

Without high ethical ideals a newspaper not only is stripped of its splendid possibilities of public service, but may become a positive danger to the community. There will naturally be a course in ethics, but training in ethical principles must not be confined to that. It must pervade all the courses. Ideals, character, professional standards not to be infringed without shame, a sense of honor which, as Burke said of the totally undeserving French noblesse, feels a stain like a wound: these will be the motif of the whole institution, never forgotten even in its most practical work.

News is important—it is the very life of a paper. But what is life without character? What is the life of a nation or of an individual without honor, without heart and soul?

Above knowledge, above news, above intelligence, the heart and soul of a paper lie in its moral sense, in its courage, its integrity, its humanity, its sympathy for the oppressed, its independence, its devotion to the public welfare, its anxiety to render public service.

Without these there may be smart journalists, but never a truly great or honorable one.

LITERATURE.

Everybody says a journalist must study literature. True—but how? A college course is too short to allow even the barest introduction to all the great works with which a newspaper writer ought to be familiar. But it can make a beginning, which can be intelligent and thorough as far as it goes. The student would have time enough to become intimately acquainted with a few of the masterpieces whose web of imagery and allusion has become part of the texture of English style.

Perhaps I may take it for granted that in this course particular attention will be paid to the literature of politics, from Plato to Burke, from the letters of Junius to Hamilton's famous Federalist letters, and from Jefferson to Lincoln.

TRUTH AND ACCURACY.

Everybody says that a journalist ought to be taught the importance of truth and accuracy. But how?

Journalism implies the duty and art of omniscience. A newspaper never admits that there is anything it does not know. But, while the newspaper may know everything, the man who helps to make it does not, and owing to the limited capacity of the human brain he never can.

More important, therefore, than filling him up with facts that can never reach the measure of his needs is his instruction in the art of finding things when they are required. Does a reader ask how many national bank-notes were outstanding in 1867? The editor may not know, but by turning to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency he can find out, and then the paper knows.

The library of reference is the editor's best friend, and the art of going at once to the proper source for any needed piece of information is one of the most useful arts a journalist can possibly acquire. And is not this something that could easily be taught in a class-room.

The bibliography of books of reference, with instruction in the art of finding data with speed and precision, would make a well-defined college course. There is always some best source for every kind of information—some original source from which the facts trickle through all sorts of media, and finally reach the public at second, third or fourth hand.

To know these sources of exact knowledge, to be able to put one's hand on them instantly, and so to be able to state facts with absolute confidence in their accuracy—could there be any more useful accomplishments for a journalist?

HISTORY.

"He alone reads history aright who, observing how powerfully circumstances influence the feelings and opinions of men, how often virtues pass into vices and paradoxes into axioms, learns to distinguish what is accidental and transitory in human nature from what is essential and immutable."—MACAULAY.

Everybody says that a School of Journalism must teach history. But how?

The world's historical records fill thousands of volumes. The utmost that any scholar can do in a whole lifetime is to dip into this mass of material here and there, and take out something that he particularly wants.

But the average college class is composed of young men with all kinds of purposes, and therefore with all kinds of wants, and these young men must all be taught together. Therefore the professor, perforce, prepares for them a neutral course.

Now, let us suppose that instead of lecturing for the general student in a general way, a professor of history should concentrate sharply upon the special object of the journalist, upon the special, separate needs of his training. Might he not then find time to throw light upon such subjects as these:

The history of politics. ("History," said Seeley, "is past politics and politics is present history.")

The growth and development of free institutions and the causes of their decay.

Revolutions, reforms and changes of government.

The influence of public opinion upon all progress.

Legislation.

Taxation.

Moral movements.

Slavery and war.

Conflicts between capital and labor.

The history of colonization, illuminating American policy at European experience.

The history of journalism.

Of course in this review general history would be lightly touched, English history more thoroughly, and American history would have several times as much attention as all the rest combined. And through all its phases would run the idea of progress, especially the progress of justice, of civilization, of humanity, of public opinion, and of the democratic idea and ideal.

SOCIOLOGY.

Everybody says that a College of Journalism should teach sociology. But how?

Vague and almost formless as this science is, it is full of the

raw material of the newspaper. Charles Booth's monumental seventeen volumes on the life and labor of the people of London, with its maps showing block by block where the thrifty workers congregate and where live the submerged tenth—where dens of vice elbow schools and where the saloon crowds upon the tenement—are the last condensation of a hundred years of reporting. Sociology, the science of the life of man in society, is the systematization of facts which it is the daily business of the journalist to collect.

The chief difficulty in teaching this science is that it is so very broad—like a river in flood, without any definite channel. But a professor who knows what to leave out can frame a course, theoretical and practical, that will be one of the best possible introductions to newspaper work.

ECONOMICS.

Everybody says that a College of Journalism should teach economics. But how?

May I not say with confidence that it should not confine itself to the old, arid, abstract, political economy, but should deal with the new play of industrial and commercial forces that is transforming modern society?

The relations between capital and labor, for instance. Can a journalist be too well informed about that? There are things here of which the old economists, with their "haggling of the market" and their "natural laws of wages," never dreamed.

THE ENEMIES OF THE REPUBLIC.

There are dangers ahead for the Republic. The demagogue is in the land. He is trying to array society into two camps. There is a new irrepressible conflict which it is folly to ignore. The stupendous growth of corporate power; the enormous increase in individual fortunes, combined to control railroad systems and industries, defiant of law and destructive of competition; the growing inequalities in life, in station and in opportunity; the practical disfranchisement of many millions of citizens equal under the Constitution; the enormous mass of illiteracy and political unfitness in the Southern States; the intensified antagonism of labor against corporate capital, of employees against employers—are problems which will tax the wisdom of our statesmen and the serene self-confidence of our people.

This confidence would be sublime, if it were not blind! What reason have we for thinking that our Government is exempt from the mutations of history? Is not, in fact, our Republic liable to popular passion, sitting as it does in a glass house, subject to the conflicts, the disturbances and the possible reactions of elections every two and four years?

A change of 25,000 votes in certain close States in 1896 would have put Mr. Bryan into the White House and have given him the appointment of three Supreme Court justices. With growing discontent, with appeals to ignorance by some newspapers, powerfully assisted by the proceedings of some financiers who act on the principle, "after us the deluge," who can be so dense as not to see the certainty of popular reaction against the money power, the rich, especially in hard times? Is it inconceivable that an element that could command over six million votes in 1896 might, under other conditions, secure twenty-five thousand more? Who can be so over-confident of the future as not to see that the very fire of liberty, maintained by universal suffrage, brings danger every two years or every four years, unless that liberty be regulated by law, order, intelligence and self-control?

And can we ignore the growing power and intelligence of organized labor in any course of economic study? Not only do the labor-unions represent organized antagonism against organized capital, but they now display this very remarkable development—that they do not represent poor labor, destitute labor, as they formerly did and are supposed by some still to do, but what may fairly be called semi-capitalistic labor. Is it not most significant that after a six months' strike in the anthracite regions, during which the idle miners were reported to have drawn a million dollars from the funds of their union, that union now has, on the authority of Mr. John Mitchell, approximately another million dollars in its treasury? The laborers, in fact, have become semi-capitalists through organization. When they are armed with such a weapon, with the power of cooperation, with a strong leader, and with at least a million of votes for which the politicians of both parties are bidding, are there not sufficient possibilities to make the situation worth the study of men who assume to be popular teachers?

And Socialism!—a new economics in itself—treated as beyond the pale of respectable discussion a few years ago and now in prin-

ciple actually triumphant in Germany, France, and even in so conservative a country as England—whose bill for the purchase and distribution of landed estates in Ireland is the essence of state Socialism—what of that? The German socialists openly refuse to be considered simply as a political party, accepting the present situation and trying to improve existing institutions from within. They proclaim their purpose as distinctly revolutionary.

We have socialistic beginnings in America, such as demands for the Government ownership of mines and railroads and a pension roll on which we have spent three thousand million dollars since the civil war, and to which, already containing a million names, 300,000 new names have just been added by an act of Executive usurpation. But our Socialism has no leaders like Jaurès and Bebel—two of the greatest intellects in Europe.

How soon shall we have two such men in America?—not gifted merely with Mr. Bryan's talent for oratory, but with sound judgment, with stable character and with sincerity of purpose that would give them a hold on the people, not to be obtained except through that confidence which only such sincerity of character and soundness of judgment breed?

ARBITRATION.

And what are we to say of arbitration, that great engine of civilization, belonging equally to economics and to politics, and perhaps to ethics, which is daily proving its value as a substitute for disturbances, disorder, riot and war? The very act of submitting a dispute to arbitration proves that there is something to be said on both sides. The men who arrogantly issue demands for which they offer no reason but simple power have "nothing to arbitrate." Before an arbitration tribunal questions are discussed on their merits. Appeals to prejudice, to class or national animosities, to cynical self-interest, are dropped. Every such hearing is a lesson in order and civilization.

There is always a tendency on the part of the weaker side to ask for arbitration and on that of the stronger to refuse it. Here is the opportunity of the press to bring its moral force into the dispute and overcome the obstinacy of brute strength by the pressure of public opinion.

The literature of arbitration is already immense. The workings of experiments in compulsory arbitration, of boards of con-

ciliation, of permanent State arbitration tribunals, of standing arbitration agreements between labor-unions and employers, and of the long line of international settlements leading up to the establishment of the world's court of arbitration at The Hague, would furnish material in themselves for a full and most valuable course of study for a journalist.

STATISTICS.

Everybody says that statistics should be taught. But how?

Statistics are not simply figures. It is said that nothing lies like figures—except facts. You want statistics to tell you the truth. You can find truth there if you know how to get at it, and romance, human interest, humor and fascinating revelations as well. The journalist must know how to find all these things—truth, of course, first. His figures must bear examination. It is much better to understate than to overstate his case, so that his critics and not himself may be put to confusion when they challenge him to verify his comparisons.

He must not read his statistics blindly; he must be able to test them by knowledge and by common sense. He must always be on the alert to discover how far they can actually be trusted—and what they really mean. The analysis of statistics to get at the essential truth of them has become a well-developed science, whose principles are systematically taught. And what a fascinating science it is! What romance can equal the facts of our national growth?

Is it not a stupendous fact that there are 204,000 miles of railroad in the United States (more than in the whole of Europe) owned by companies having a total capitalization of more than \$14,000,000,000, par value, affording livelihood to 5,000,000 of persons (employees and their families) and distributing \$178,000,000 in dividends to owners and \$610,713,701 in wages?

The flow of our exports—over three thousand millions above imports in seven years—does not the imagination see, in these figures, the whole story of the recent forward rush of American industry—the “American Invasion” of Europe, and the homeward flight of securities? And then, are there not interesting reflections in the fact that we have spent almost exactly the same amount in pensions in the past thirty years? What a tribute to our institutions—what hope for the future—in the fact that

18,000,000 pupils are attending school or college! And immigration—more than 20,000,000 since 1820—nearly a million arrivals last year—a New Zealand swallowed in a year; an Australia in four years;—surely it looks as if Europe were being transplanted bodily to America. But when we remember that the natural increase of the population of Europe is about four millions a year, we may feel reasonably sure that the old continent will always have a few people left.

MODERN LANGUAGES.

Everybody says a School of Journalism should teach modern languages. But which?

It cannot treat them as a luxurious culture subject, or as a mental discipline. It must regard each foreign language as a tool—a key with which to unlock the life, the literature, the morals and the manners of the people that use it. “He who knows no other tongue,” said Goethe, “knows little of his own.” And every additional tongue he can master is a new asset for the journalist. The special advantage of French is on the side of style. Order, precision, lucidity, the sense of form, are all French characteristics of especial value to the journalist.

An advantage of German is that it is, above all others, the language of translations. With that you have a key to everything else. Everything of importance in every other language, ancient or modern, has been translated into German, and translated wonderfully well. How much can be done in two or three years in the teaching of one or more modern languages as a part of that special course is a matter for the Advisory Board and the college authorities to consider.

PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

Everybody says that physical science should be taught. But how?

Even when Pope said: “The proper study of mankind is man”—there were some things outside of himself that were worth a little of a philosopher’s attention. But, in this age, it is impossible to make even a pretence of intelligence, not to speak of filling the post of a public teacher without, at least, a little scientific knowledge.

The journalist need not be a specialist in science; he need not

even follow the ordinary scientific courses at college which are too choked with small details to answer his needs. But ought he not to have some bold outlines of the principles of physics, chemistry, biology and astronomy, in the light of the latest discoveries, with such an introduction to the best authorities on these subjects as would enable him to follow them out to any further extent by himself?

THE STUDY OF NEWSPAPERS.

Everybody says that in the training of a journalist the current newspapers must be studied. But how?

Suppose the managing or chief editor of a great daily, moved by a generous zeal for his profession, should give several hours to a thorough study of the newspapers of the current day. Then let us imagine him saying to a class: "Here is the best and here is the worst story of the day"—and telling why. "Here is the wrong of the day; here is the injustice that needs to be righted; here is the best editorial; here is a brilliant paragraph; here is a bit of sentimental trash; here is a superb 'beat'; here is a scandalous 'fake,' for which the perpetrator ought to go to Sing Sing; here is a grossly inaccurate and misleading headline; here is an example of crass ignorance of foreign politics; here is something 'crammed' from an almanac by a man who does not know the meaning of figures when he sees them."

If the editors of twenty of the foremost journals in the country should deliver such lectures in turn, "demonstrating" from the day's paper as the lecturer in a medical college does from the object of his clinic, could a young man worth his room in a newspaper office go through a year of their training without learning to see and to think? Would not that course alone be a liberal education?

THE POWER OF IDEAS.

"Public opinion is at once the guide and the monitor of statesmen."—ERSKINE MAY.

Everybody says that journalistic ideas should be taught. But how?—and by whom?

Goethe said: "Everything has been thought of before, but the difficulty is to think of it again." If everything has been thought of before, it can all be recalled and set down in order. You can make a list of all the important ideas that brought honor and suc-

cess in journalism in the last twenty years. Would it be possible for anybody, unless he were a fool, to survey for three hundred days in the year a procession of ideas on which successful and respectable newspapers had been founded and maintained without absorbing, digesting, assimilating and unconsciously taking into his brain thought material which he could apply to his own needs?

Fools have had no place in my plans for a College of Journalism. They belong with the journalists who are "born, not made."

To think rightly, to think instantly, to think incessantly, to think intensely, to seize opportunities when others let them go by—this is the secret of success in journalism. To teach this is twenty times more important than to teach Latin or Greek.

Napoleon said that every battle depended upon one thought, but that one thought, though seeming to be a sudden inspiration, was the result of a whole life of thinking and experience.

Thought is the only power that has no limits. You may say of a steam boiler: "This will develop a thousand horse-power," but who can say where the influence of a thought will stop?

The French Revolution sprang from the thought of a few men. Voltaire, Rousseau and the Encyclopædists said that the idea of the people belonging to the King by divine right was preposterous; that the people belonged to themselves. This thought-germ floated in the air; the American revolution stimulated it and suddenly the awakened people made the thought a deed.

An old thought applied to a new situation is new. Robespierre spoke of "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" long before Lincoln was born. Yet who remembers Robespierre in connection with that phrase which Lincoln re-created and immortalized?

Before the days of railroads, of telegraphs or of great industrial and commercial combinations a thinker in France attacked corporations as a danger to the State, because, having no souls, they were destitute of that sense of pride and personal responsibility, of individual shame and honor, without which good citizenship is impossible. It was the idea of Helvetius that devotion to the State is the first duty of patriotism. In his day that idea seemed purely theoretical—corporations were not then really formidable. But the thought was sound and the time has come when it is practical.

"There is nothing new under the sun." Mr. Bryan's idea of

scaling down debts by law is as old as social discontent. If he had read history attentively he would not have taken himself so seriously as an agitator. His scheme was tried by Lycurgus, by Solon, by the Gracchi; it was part of the programme of Catiline. Even the method of doing it, by depreciating the value of the coinage, was applied repeatedly by European Kings in the Middle Ages, and later.

None of us can hope to be original. We simply take from the great stock of old thoughts what suits our purpose, and it depends upon ourselves and our training whether we select the good or the bad.

PRINCIPLES OF JOURNALISM.

Everybody says that we should teach the principles and methods of journalism. But how?

Well, it seems impossible to do so, without lectures explaining the subject in a systematic way. But would not still more be gained from the actual preparation by the students of a newspaper to be printed, perhaps, once a week at first, by means of a press and plant, for which I have provided, in the college building?

Such a paper would give practice in all branches of newspaper work—editing, reporting, criticising, copy-reading, proof-reading, making-up—everything, in short, that a young man ought to be able to do before he ventures to undertake the work of a journalist. It would be under the supervision of a professor who would not only wield the pencil as ruthlessly as a real editor does, but would also do what the real editor has no time to do—tell why he did it. Sometimes all the students might be asked to write editorials on the same subject and the best one could be printed, with an explanation of the reasons for its selection.

If the ablest twenty editors in the country or in the East, or in New York, were to consent to take turns once or twice a year in analyzing and criticising the paper so produced, and the New York dailies, putting their best thought and experience into the task, the students would have the benefit, not of one mind, but of twenty, and these the best in the profession. Would not editors in sympathy with the plan do this much as a matter of pride, of honor? By such practice, under such expert criticism, the journalist would be trained for work, as the young officer is trained for war by military manœuvres.

But the object of the course would be always to make real

editors, to develop right thinking—to teach the student that what makes a newspaper is not type, nor presses, nor advertising, but brains, conscience, character working out into public service.

FINALE—THE NEWS.

But I must stop—and should perhaps apologize for the interminable length of this paper, which has exceeded all reasonable bounds. The writing of it has convinced me that the two years' course of study suggested for the College of Journalism would be altogether too short—for, after all, we have not yet said anything about news.

It is not that I underestimate its value. News is the life of a paper. It is perennially changing—more varied than any kaleidoscope, bringing every day some new surprise, some new sensation—always the unexpected.

But I have no time to treat the subject adequately, and ought to confess that the editorial discussion of politics and public questions has ever been the matter of deepest personal interest to me.

News is very interesting, but there are others who no doubt will take care of it better than I. Give me a news editor who has been well grounded, who has the foundations of accuracy, love of truth and an instinct for the public service, and there will be no trouble about his gathering the news.

PUBLIC SERVICE THE SUPREME END.

“What are great gifts but the correlative of great work? We are not born for ourselves but for our kind, for our neighbors, for our country.”—CARDINAL NEWMAN.

It has been said by some that my object in founding the College of Journalism was to help young men who wish to make this their vocation. Others have commended it as an effort to raise journalism to its real rank as one of the learned professions. This is true. But while it is a great pleasure to feel that a large number of young men will be helped to a better start in life by means of this college, this is not my primary object. Neither is the elevation of the profession which I love so much and regard so highly. In all my planning the chief end I had in view was the welfare of the Republic. It will be the object of the college to make better journalists, who will make better newspapers, which will better serve

the public. It will impart knowledge—not for its own sake, but to be used for the public service. It will try to develop character, but even that will be only a means to the one supreme end—the public good. We are facing that hitherto-unheard-of portent—an innumerable, world-wide, educated, and self-conscious democracy. The little revolutions of the past have been effected by a few leaders working upon an ignorant populace, conscious only of vague feelings of discontent. Now the masses read. They know their grievances and their power. They discuss in New York the position of labor in Berlin and in Sydney. Capital, too, is developing a world-wide class feeling. It likewise has learned the power of cooperation.

What will be the state of society and of politics in this Republic seventy years hence, when some of the children now in school will be still living? Shall we preserve the government of the Constitution, the equality of all citizens before the law and the purity of justice—or shall we have the government of either money or the mob?

The answers to these questions will depend largely upon the kind of instruction the people of that day draw from their newspapers—the text-books, the orators, the preachers of the masses.

I have said so much of the need for improvement in journalism that to avoid misconception I must put on record my appreciation of the really admirable work so many newspaper men are doing already. The competent editorial writer, for instance—how much sound information he furnishes every day! How generally just his judgments are, and how prompt his decisions! Unknown to the people he serves, he is in close sympathy with their feelings and aspirations, and, when left to himself and unhampered by party prejudices, he generally interprets their thought as they would wish to express it themselves.

It is not too much to say that the press is the only great organized force which is actively and as a body upholding the standard of civic righteousness. There are many political reformers among the clergy, but the pulpit as an institution is concerned with the Kingdom of Heaven, not with the Republic of America. There are many public-spirited lawyers, but the bar as a profession works for its retainers, and no law-defying trust ever came to grief from a dearth of legal talent to serve it. Physicians work for their patients and architects for their patrons. The press alone makes the

public interests its own. "What is everybody's business is nobody's business"—except the journalist's; it is his by adoption. But for his care almost every reform would fall stillborn. He holds officials to their duty. He exposes secret schemes of plunder. He promotes every hopeful plan of progress. Without him public opinion would be shapeless and dumb. He brings all classes, all professions together, and teaches them to act in concert on the basis of their common citizenship.

The Greeks thought that no republic could be successfully governed if it were too large for all the citizens to come together in one place. The Athenian democracy could all meet in the popular assembly. There public opinion was made, and accordingly as the people listened to a Pericles or to a Cleon the state flourished or declined. The orator that reaches the American democracy is the newspaper. It alone makes it possible to keep the political blood in healthful circulation in the veins of a continental republic. We have—it is unfortunately true—a few newspapers which advocate dangerous fallacies and falsehoods, appealing to ignorance, to partisanship, to passion, to popular prejudice, to poverty, to hatred of the rich, to socialism, sowing the seeds of discontent—eventually sure, if unchecked, to produce lawlessness and bloodshed. Virtue, said Montesquieu, is the principle of a republic, and therefore a republic, which in its purity is the most desirable of all forms of government, is the hardest of all to preserve. For there is nothing more subject to decay than virtue.

Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together. An able, disinterested, public-spirited press, with trained intelligence to know the right and courage to do it, can preserve that public virtue without which popular government is a sham and a mockery. A cynical, mercenary, demagogic press will produce in time a people as base as itself. The power to mould the future of the Republic will be in the hands of the journalists of future generations. This is why I urge my colleagues to aid the important experiment which I have ventured to endow. Upon their generous aid and cooperation the ultimate success of the project must depend.

JOSEPH PULITZER.